



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/612,551	07/07/2000	Hiroshi Tanabe	NEC WNZ-2212	9380

7590 09/25/2003

Norman P Soloway
Hayes Soloway Hennessey Grossman & Hage PC
175 Canal Street
Manchester, NH 03101

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

EVANS, GEOFFREY S

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

1725

DATE MAILED: 09/25/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/612,551	TANABE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Geoffrey S Evans	1725	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 August 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2-16 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1 and 17-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or, b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>16</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1725

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1,17,18 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al. in U.S. Patent No. 5,932,118 in view of Mori et al. in Japan Patent No. 7-266,064. Yamamoto et al. discloses a photo processing method for crystallizing an amorphous semiconductor film (e.g. see column 1,line 14) using an excimer laser (see column 8,line 14) and a mask made of a plurality of slits (see figure 9). While Yamamoto recognizes the desirability of using a beam of generally uniform energy distribution (e.g. see column 6,lines 34-35) the reference does not disclose the specific amount that the laser beam is uniform. Mori et al. teaches using a homogenizer (element 4) to restrict the fluctuations of the energy beam to about 2 to 3 percent (see paragraph 12 of Mori et al.). It would have been obvious to adapt Yamamoto et al. in

view of Mori et al. to provide the homogenizer used by Mori et al. to increase the uniformity of the resulting processing of the amorphous semiconductor film.

4. Claims 19,20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al. in view of Mori et al. as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Suzuki et al. in Japan Patent No. 6-267,826. Suzuki et al. teaches using a projection lens (element 15) to project the shape of the light beam emitting from the mask (reticle R) onto the workpiece. It would have been obvious to adapt Yamamoto et al. in view of Mori et al. and Suzuki et al. to replace the imaging lenses (element 6) of Yamamoto et al. with the single projection lens of Suzuki et al. to reduce the number of lenses to project the laser beam.

5. Applicant's arguments filed August 8,2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments regarding the meanings of the words "accuracy" and "precision" is moot since neither word used in the claims. (However even assuming the words "accuracy" and "precision" have different meanings Applicant has merely concluded that the Mori and Suzuki references are referring to precision while the instant application is referring to accuracy (Applicant has not pointed to language in these two references or to the instant application to support the argument)). In any event, in this office action, and any subsequent office action since the word "accuracy" is not defined in the specification by a special meaning the word "accuracy" is considered to have the definition of "the extent to which a given measurement agrees with the standard value for that measurement". See page 10 of the 1982-revised edition of "The Random House College Dictionary". Also in this office action, and any

subsequent office action since the word "precision" is not defined in the specification by a special meaning the word "precision" is considered to have the definition of "the extent to which a given set of measurements of some sample agree with their mean." See page 1043 of the 1982-revised edition of "The Random House College Dictionary". In any event, Mori in Japan Patent No. 7-266,064, shows in figure 2a and 2b that the range of fluctuation is limited (i.e. bounded) and therefore has "accuracy".

The 103 rejection based upon the Suzuki reference is withdrawn.

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Geoffrey S Evans whose telephone number is (703)-308-1653. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 6:30AM to 4:00 PM, alternate Fridays off.

Art Unit: 1725

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Dunn can be reached on (703)-308-3318. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)-308-0661.



Geoffrey S Evans
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1725

GSE

703-308-3318

Tom Dunn

Art Unit 1725

872-9306

703-308-0661

Tom Dunn

703-308-3318

Tom Dunn

703-308-0661

703-308-0661